

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte CASSANDRA MOLLETT, MOLLIE HELLIGE,
& DANIEL AHLES

Appeal 2008-5589
Application 09/474,671
Technology Center 3600

Mailed: December 3, 2008

Before DALE M. SHAW, *Chief Appeals Administrator*
SHAW, *Chief Appeals Administrator*.

ORDER REMANDING APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received at the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on September 2, 2008. A Docketing Notice was mailed and Appeal No 2008-5589 was assigned on September 10, 2008. A review of the application has revealed that the application was not ready for

an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being remanded to the Examiner. The matter requiring attention is identified below.

Claims 1-9 of the instant application are set forth as method claims that may not fall with one of the four statutory categories of invention recited in 35 U.S.C. § 101. On May 15, 2008, the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examining Policy, John J. Love, issued a memorandum entitled "Clarification of "Processes" under 35 U.S.C. § 101." This memorandum is further used in conjunction with the Interim Guidelines and the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2106.IV.B, when determining whether a claimed invention falls within a statutory category of invention. *See In re Bilski*, No. 2007-1130, ___ F.3d ___, 2008 WL 4757110 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 30, 2008) (en banc). Thus, there is a question as to whether claims 1-9 meet the requirements of being a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is remanded to the Examiner to determine if claims 1-9 meet the requirements of being a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

If there are any questions pertaining to this order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

DMS

Brooks Kushman P.C.
1000 Town Center
Twenty-Second Floor
Southfield, MI 48075